UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,336	0/535,336 01/06/2006 Kazuhiro Ono		P27943	3742
	7590 02/27/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.0		EXAMINER	
	CLARKE PLACE	-	ROBERTS, LEZAH	
KESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			NOTIFICAL TRONG DATE	DDI WEDVI (ODE
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/535,336	ONO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LEZAH W. ROBERTS	1612	

-							
	LEZAH W. ROBERTS	1612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Continued Examination (RCE).	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection						
b) The period for reply expires of months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL	' ('						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>08 January 2008</u>. A br the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS 	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the				
	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co							
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			he issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL 204)				
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al 		imely filed amendmen	at canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).	iowabie ii subiliilled iii a separale, i	illiely filed afficialfiel	it canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3</u> -7.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Frederick Krass/	A seed MAID 1 11						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612	/Lezah W Roberts/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612						

ı

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to Sanker, the reference suggest using the plants comprising polyphenols in combination with the acids when it discloses the components in the specification. Although glycolic acid is not a preferred acid, is disclosed as being an acid that may be utilized as buffering agent. Although there are many extracts to choose from, much less than buffering agent, cranberry concentrate was the plant extract used in most of the Examples.

In regards to Zhu in view of Melman, although Melman prefers acetic acid, the reference teaches these acids are equivalents and may be used in place of one another or in combination with one another. Furthermore both references disclose antibacterial compositions, and as stated previously, it would have been obvious to combine the two compositions as supported by In re Kerkhoven. The reference is not required to show examples with every acid listed.

In regards to Melman in view of Oriza, as disclosed above, Melman does not have to disclose an example for every acid. See Examiner's response in regards to Zhu in view of Melman above.

2